

REMARKS

Claim 3 and 4 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 22, and 23 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1, 2, and 5-23 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 5-23 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Maloney.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, the claim as amended recites a sensor configured to use a 4-tuple “to represent a data item to be sent to the analysis engine for analysis” wherein the 4-tuple “comprises a semantic type, data type, data type size, and value of the data item and represents the data item in a manner that enables the analysis engine to receive and use the data item regardless of how the data item is represented and organized on a platform associated with the sensor.” The claim thus recites a specific manner in which a data item is represented, as described more fully, without limitation, in the Application at page 31, line 15 to page 38, line 20. The Application describes the advantages of the approach recited in claim 1, as amended. Id. By contrast, Maloney is silent with respect to how data is represented by the local and remote sensors that provide data to the discovery tool 12 described by Maloney, other than to state that once received the data is sent by the discovery tool 12 to a “flat file” that is later converted by a parsing tool 18 into a form usable by the information security analysis system 10. See, e.g., Maloney at col. 6, lines 37-62; col. 7, lines 20-55. Maloney therefore does not describe or suggest a sensor configured to represent a data item as a 4-tuple that “comprises a semantic type, data type, data type size, and value of the data item and represents the data item in a manner that enables the analysis engine to receive and use the data item regardless of how the data item is represented and organized on a platform associated with the sensor,” as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2 and 5-21 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 1, claims 22 and 23 recite a 4-tuple that “comprises a semantic type, data type, data type size, and value of the data item and represents the data item in a manner that enables the analysis engine to receive and use the data item regardless of how the data item is

represented and organized on a platform associated with the sensor.” As such, claims 22 and 23 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/14/04

William J. James

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014